

-----Original Message-----

From: Roy Steeves [<mailto:RCSteevesJr@Comcast.net>]
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2011 4:55 PM
To: EBSA, E-ORI - EBSA
Subject: FW: Definition of Fiduciary Proposed Rule

-----Original Message-----

From: Roy Steeves [<mailto:RCSteevesJr@Comcast.net>]
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2011 2:56 PM
To: ORI@dol.gov
Subject: Definition of Fiduciary Proposed Rule

Hi,

I am a retiree of Lucent Technologies.

I know the NRLN is trying to protect my pension assets (and the assets of millions of others). I don't know all the legal wording, etc., but I would like to request the definition be modified to protect my pension assets. It is very unsettling to me, and destabilizing to our economy, to allow foreign companies (Alcatel in my case) to opt-out of the responsibilities they accepted when they bought companies based in the United States. If my pension is affected, I can't spend money that helps our economy to recover (small though my contribution may be).

The following sentence is, I think, the essence of the NRLN position. I copied it from their letter to the Department of Labor.

If the stated objectives of the Proposed Rule are to be fully achieved, it is essential that the definition of fiduciary in this rulemaking requires all fiduciaries be subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. courts.

Thank you,
Roy C. Steeves Jr.